the Comptroller of Currency, and is headquartered and located in Glen Allen,

commercial bank with a federally approved charter, supervised by the Office of

10

14 15

13

17

16

19

20

18

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Virginia. Capital One Bank is a citizen of Virginia for purposes of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1348.

- 3. Defendant Capital One Services, LLC ("Capital One Services") is a Delaware corporation headquartered and having a principal place of business in McLean, Virginia.
- 4. Hunt & Henriques is a general law partnership between attorneys Michael S. Hunt and Janalie A. Henriques, whose headquarters and principle place of business is in the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, State of California.
- 5. The Moore Law Group, A Professional Corporation is incorporated in the State of California. Its headquarters and principal place of business is in the City of Santa Ana, County of Orange, State of California.
- 6. ARS National Services, Inc. is a California corporation whose headquarters and principal place of business are located in Escondido, California.
- 7. This court also original jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the substantial questions of federal law at issue in this matter are predominant.
- 8. Venue in this judicial district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because most of the acts, omissions and events complained of by plaintiff were perpetrated or occurred in this judicial district.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Capital One Services, Hunt & Henriques and The Moore Law Group were employees or agents of defendant Capital One Bank and in doing the things alleged below each acted in the course and scope of their employment or agency relationship with Capital One Bank.

- 10. Plaintiff has had no business or contractual relationship with any defendant in this matter, including defendant Capital One Bank. He did not authorize defendant to obtain his credit background so the defendant could review it before deciding whether to make an offer. He never received any offer of credit or other services in connection with the alleged relationship, and never solicited any such offer. He never authorized or permitted any third party to take any of these actions, and no one else had any legal right to do so on his behalf. He never obtained any money, services or goods paid for by defendants, and never authorized anyone else to do so, either.
- 11. In or around June, 2011, defendant Capital One Bank first attempted to shake down defendant. Either Capital One Bank or one of its authorized agents or employees contacted plaintiff directly, and falsely claimed that he owed Capital One Bank more than \$30,000. Capital One Bank and its agent or employee threatened to damage plaintiff's credit if he did not pay the alleged debt. Plaintiff, who had no business relationship with Capital One Bank and owed it nothing, disputed the existence of the debt and demanded proof. To this end, and in good faith, he provided his correct mailing address in Redondo Beach, California, which no defendant previously had.
- 12. Capital One Bank did not provide any proof to plaintiff as requested. It did, however, fail to acknowledge the dispute as to the validity of the claimed debt. It did not properly report the dispute to any of the credit bureaus to which it regularly reports, and instead continued to falsely report that plaintiff owed them a debt and that the alleged debt was past due.
- 12. Capital One Bank's actions severely damaged plaintiff's credit. Plaintiff, prior to his June, 2011 encounter with defendant, had good credit and several active credit cards with banks because he regularly paid what he owed. One of his credit suppliers, CitiBank, obtained his credit report from one or more major credit bureaus, and saw Capital One Bank's false allegations. Plaintiff is

informed and believes, and thereon alleges that solely because of Capital One Bank's false allegations, CitiBank first reduced, and eventually terminated credit services.

- 13. Plaintiff formally disputed defendant's alleged debt with the major credit bureaus. Despite having no proof of the debt, and their knowledge that the debt was not, and is not, valid, Capital One Bank falsely purported to "validate" the debt with the major credit bureaus and continued to falsely report both the bogus debt and its alleged delinquency to these credit bureaus. To this day, Capital One Bank continues to falsely report the bogus debt and its alleged delinquency to credit bureaus and others, further damaging plaintiff's credit. On information and belief, Capital One Bank's false and fraudulent reporting of the bogus debt and delinquency was and continues to be published in writing to the major credit bureaus. This false information has already resulted in plaintiff's loss of credit availability. Plaintiff is informed and believes the defendant's false accusations also caused an extreme increase in the cost of credit where it is available to him.
- 14. Plaintiff is an employee of a large and well-known local defense contractor. Defendant's false claims and negative reporting pose a threat to plaintiff's employment and future career advancement. As a defense contractor, his employer expects plaintiff to be trustworthy, prudent and fiscally responsible, and these qualifications are directly related to his perceived ability to do his job. Plaintiff is informed, believes, fears and thereon alleges that defendant's false statements and allegations of serious delinquent debt may injure his career by, among other things, subjecting him to discipline by his employer, up to and including termination. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that he will be denied promotion to any related internal job he applies for which requires any additional security clearance

///

because defendant's spurious allegations will result in the denial of such security clearances.

- 15. Despite his requests for proof of the debt made to all defendants, defendant did not send anything at all to plaintiff until after January 1, 2012 when Capital One Bank sent a billing statement falsely claiming plaintiff owed them about \$31,007.
- 16. In an attempt to mitigate his already serious damages, and because all named defendants refused to cooperate with his requests for proof of the debt, plaintiff retained counsel to investigate defendant's claims, provide defendant with relevant information if necessary to informally resolve the dispute, and protect his rights. The hiring of counsel was made necessary by the conduct of defendant and its agents and employees, and plaintiff incurred significant costs as a result of being forced by defendants to conduct his own investigation and which costs were increased as a result of defendant's willful failure to cooperate or act in good faith.
- 17. On February 1, 2012, counsel wrote to defendant Capital One Bank about this matter on his law firm letterhead. At all times relevant herein, counsel's name, telephone number and mailing address were readily ascertainable by defendant and all of its agents and employees both from the letterhead itself, and from the California State Bar website. Capital One Bank received counsel's letter on February 6, 2012. This letter informed Capital One Bank that plaintiff retained counsel and that all further communications should be in writing and directed to counsel rather than plaintiff. Defendants Capital One Services, Hunt & Henriques, The Moore Law Group, and ARS National Services all had actual and constructive knowledge of this letter and its contents.

- 18. The February 1, 2012 letter was a demand for a bill of particulars under California law, requesting various documents that would exist if the debt were real.
- 19. Defendants Capital One Services, Hunt & Henriques, ARS National Services, and The Moore Law Group all have as their principal business purpose the collection of debts allegedly owed to others besides themselves, including defendant Capital One Bank. All of these defendants and their agents and employees regularly use telephones, mail, the Internet, and other such instrumentalities of interstate commerce in their efforts to collect those alleged debts. Defendant Capital One Bank either created or hired every other defendant to operate as "debt collectors" within the meaning of the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 USC §§ 1692 et seq.) and California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788 et seq.).
- and had instructed defendant Capital One Bank and its agents or assigns not to do so, and with actual and constructive knowledge that the law forbade it, defendants and their agents or employees, while acting in the course and scope of said agency and employment, each repeatedly communicated with plaintiff dozens of times through the mail and through telephone calls after February 6, 2012. The purpose of each of these telephone calls to plaintiff was to coerce plaintiff to pay money to them, even though they knew and should have known that he owed them nothing. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that defendants used an automatic telephone dialing system to repeatedly bother plaintiff at his home, work and cellular telephones. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that many of these telephone calls used an artificial or prerecorded voice. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that on many or all of these occasions, defendants knowingly concealed the true origin of these telephone calls by knowingly and willfully

- "spoofing" their caller identification information so as to transmit inaccurate, misleading or false caller identification information to plaintiff.
- 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at the time of making each of these telephone calls, each defendants' employees and agents originated the calls within the United States or one of its territories. At every time these calls were made, defendants and their employees and agents knew that it was unlawful to use an automatic telephone dialing system to call plaintiff's telephone numbers and that he never expressly consented to any such communications; they all knew that it was forbidden to use any artificial or prerecorded voice in connection with their collection scheme. At all times, defendant and its agents and employees knew these practices were forbidden by federal law, including, but not limited to: 47 USC § 227 and 47 CFR § 64.1604(a).
- 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants' agents and their employees acting in the course and scope of their agency and/or employment collectively made at least approximately 40 such calls.
- 23. At all of these times, and as already stated, these defendants all knew that plaintiff was represented by counsel and that such direct communications with plaintiff were prohibited by the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 USC § 1692c(2)) and California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788 et seq.).
- 24. Rather than timely respond to plaintiff's demand for a bill of particulars, Capital One Bank by and through its agents Hunt & Henriques sued plaintiff in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. YC066523. That complaint was filed on February 21, 2012. Plaintiff was never served with that complaint. Capital One Bank and Hunt & Henriques knew that the lawsuit against plaintiff was fatally defective and that there was no evidence whatsoever that plaintiff agreed to anything.

Additionally, Hunt & Henriques, which holds itself out as "specializing" in the recovery of alleged delinquent consumer obligations, knew that California procedural rules precluded the introduction of any account evidence which defendant did not timely provide in response to plaintiff's February 1, 2012 demand for a bill of particulars. In other words, not only was there no evidence of any debt to defendant at the time of filing of the lawsuit, but if defendant later purported to have some, it is barred from producing it in court against plaintiff. The unmeritorious and unwinnable suit was wisely dismissed (without prejudice), and for good reason, since the inevitable result would have been judgment in plaintiffs favor.

- 25. Capital One Bank, after dismissing their unwinnable lawsuit against plaintiff on April 24, 2012, ordered The Moore Law Group to reinstate collections and to threaten to sue despite defendants' actual and constructive knowledge that the suit was barred by law, fatally defective, and unsupported by the facts known to them.
- 26. Defendants' unlawful collection activities continued unabated and increased in aggravation. For instance, on July 13, 2012 one of The Moore Law Group's attorneys, Angela Dawson wrote directly to plaintiff without his counsel's knowledge or consent, despite prudently, competently, and completely reviewing the file, including the February 1, 2012 letter. Attorney Dawson's letter to plaintiff was about the alleged debt and was in knowing, willful and flagrant violation of California Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 2-100(a). The Moore Law Group knowingly and willfully continued to send letters containing misleading and outright false statements of facts, including, but not limited to, false statements about Capital One Bank's principal place of business, their ability to obtain a judgment against plaintiff, and their ability to obtain attorney fees or costs of court.

- 1 2 3 4
- 5
- 7
- 9

11

12

13

14151617

1819

20

2223

2425

26

27

28

111

- 27. In doing each of these things and permitting each of its agents, employees and attorneys to do them, all defendants acted intentionally, recklessly, willfully, and maliciously in their efforts to intentionally injure plaintiff and with conscious and flagrant disregard for his rights so as to make the imposition of punitive damages proper.
- 28. In the alternative, defendant and each of its agents, employees and attorneys acted with negligence and gross negligence in doing the things complained of.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

Violation of FDCPA (All Defendants)

29. The acts and omissions of defendants by and through its authorized agents and employees, as alleged above, violated the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act which at all times barred defendants and their agents and employees from: (a) communicating with plaintiff when they knew him to be represented by counsel (15 USC § 1692c(a)(2)); (b) using false, deceptive or misleading representations in connection with the collection of the alleged debt (15 USC § 1692e); (c) falsely representing both the character and legal status of the alleged debt and compensation which may be received by the debt collector thereon (15 USC § 1692e(2)); (d) threatening to take an action that cannot legally be taken (15 USC § 1692e(5); (e) communicating and threatening to communicate to credit reporting bureaus information they knew or should have known was false, and failing to report that the debt was disputed by plaintiff (15 USC § 1692e(8); and (f) using false and deceptive means to collect the alleged debt (15 USC § 1692e(10). Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants did all of these things. 111

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

Violation of California Rosenthal FDCPA (All Defendants)

30. The acts and omissions of defendant by and through its authorized agents and employees, as alleged above, violated the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. (Civ. Code §§ 1785 et seq.)

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

Violation of FCRA (Capital One Bank)

31. The acts and omissions of defendant by and through its authorized agents and employees, as alleged above, violated the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 USC § 1681 et seq.). Capital One Bank personally or through its authorized agents, employees and attorneys negligently failed to comply with the FCRA by reporting inaccurate and false information to consumer credit reporting bureaus concerning the alleged debt of plaintiff after plaintiff and his counsel both told them the information was inaccurate and despite the fact that its own records demonstrated the inaccuracy. Capital One Bank thus knew or should have known the information was inaccurate but reported it anyway, and refused to report it as disputed (15 USC § 1681s-2), causing plaintiff to suffer damage in an amount to be proved at trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

Unlawful Use of Telephone Equipment

(Capital One Bank, Capital One Services, ARS National Services)

32. As set forth above, defendants at no time established any contractual or business relationship with plaintiff. Plaintiff's contacts with defendants were involuntary, without consideration, and not based on any purchase or transaction of his whatsoever. And even if they were, plaintiff's counsel's letter of February 1, 2012 terminated any authority to call him. Plaintiff is informed

and believes and thereon alleges that these defendants nevertheless used an automatic telephone dialing system having the capacity to store, produce and dial telephone numbers randomly or sequentially, to dial his home and work telephone numbers as well as his cellular telephone. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that on some or all of these calls, the defendants used either an artificial or prerecorded voice. All of these acts in making said telephone calls constituted an unlawful use of telephone equipment in violation of 47 USC \S 227 and 47 CFR \S 64.1604(a).

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

Unfair Business Practices (All Defendants)

33. At all times relevant to this complaint, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 was operative and barred the above-referenced unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices acts of defendant and its agents. Each violation of the abovereferenced laws independently violated Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, injuring plaintiff, and others in an amount to be proved at trial.

17

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

Declaratory Relief (Capital One Bank)

34. In addition to the award of money damages, costs of suit, and reasonable attorney's fees according to law, plaintiff seeks, by way of this suit, declaratory relief. In other words, plaintiff requests a judicial finding that he owes no debt to, and had no contract with defendant Capital One Bank.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff Phillip Baltazar prays for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. General damages in the sum according to proof;

2. Loss of income incurred, and to be incurred according to proof; 1 3. Statutory damages according to law; 2 4. Treble damages according to law; 3 5. Punitive damages according to law; 4 6. For the interest provided by law including, but not limited to, California 5 Civil Code §3291; 6 7. Costs of suit incurred; 8. Reasonable attorney's fees where permitted according to law; 8 9. Declaratory relief; 10. Injunctive relief; and 10 11. Such other relief as this honorable court deems just and proper. 11 12 Respectfully submitted by 13 14 Cota & Zeiler 15 16 17 Date: October 22, 2012 Antonio A 18 Attorney for Plaintiff Phillip Baltazar 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

26

27

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California

Phillp Baltazar)))
Plaintiff(s) V.	SACV12 - 01844 AG (ANx) Civil Action No.
Capital One Bank (USA) N.A.; Capital One Services, LLC; Hunt & Henriques; The Moore Law Group, APC; and ARS National Services, Inc.)))
Defendant(s)	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Antonio A. Cota COTA & ZEILER, APC Lakeshore Plaza 4160 Temescal Canyon Rd., Ste. 216 Corona, CA 92883

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Date: 10-33-12

CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

	This summons for (na	me of individual and title, if any)				
was r	eceived by me on (date)					
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at (p	lace)			
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or usua	l place of abode with (name)			
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides t					
	on (date)		ndividual's last known address; or			
	☐ I served the summe	ons on (name of individual)		, who is		
	designated by law to	accept service of process on behalf o	f (name of organization)			
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I returned the sumr	nons unexecuted because		; or		
	☐ Other (specify):					
	My food one C	C 1 . 10				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00		
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information is tr	ile			
		The state of the s				
Date:						
			Server's signature			
		The state of the s	Printed name and title			
			Server's address			

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 8:12-cv-01844-AG-AN Document 1 Filed 10/23/12 Page 15 of 17 Page ID #:18

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) Phillip Baltazar	DEFENDANTS Capital One Bank (USA) N.A.; Capital One Services, LLC; Hunt & Henriques; The Moore Law Group; and ARS National Services, Inc. Attorneys (If Known)			
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you a yourself, provide same.) Cota & Zeiler, APC Lakeshore Plaza, 4160 Temescal Canyon Rd., Ste. 216, Corona, (714) 953-6600				
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.) □ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) □ 2 U.S. Government Defendant □ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of This	State	one for defendant.) F DEF 1	PTF DEF ated or Principal Place 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)	Citizen or Subje	ect of a Foreign Country 🗆 🗀		ess in Another State Nation
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: ✓ Yes ☐ CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: ☐ Yes ☐ No VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you	No (Check 'Yes	only if demanded in compla	int.)	6 Multi-
15 USC 1692 et seq. (FDCPA) for unlawful collections of a non-ex- VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)	istent debt	to a orier statement or cause.	Do not cite jurisdiction	onal statutes unless diversity.)
OTHER STATUTES 400	TORTS RSONAL INJURY Airplane Airplane Product Liability Assault, Libel & Slander Fed. Employers' Liability Marine Marine Product Liability Motor Vehicle Motor Personal Injury Product Liability Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability MIGRATION Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus- Alien Detaince Other Immigration Actions	PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 American with Disabilities - Employment 446 American with Disabilities - Other 440 Other Civil	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penal	Act Act Relations Relations Reporting & Disclosure Act Act Reporting & Disclosure Act Act Railway Labor Act Act Act Railway Labor Act Ac

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: SACV12 - 01844 AG (ANx)

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 1 of 2

Case 8:12-cv-01844-AG-AN Document 1 Filed 10/23/12 Page 16 of 17 Page ID #:19

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES If yes, list case number(s):	: Has this action been	previously filed in this court a	and dismissed, remanded or closed? ☑No □ Yes			
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: If yes, list case number(s):	Have any cases been p	previously filed in this court th	hat are related to the present case? ♥No □ Yes			
(Check all boxes that apply)	Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case: (Check all boxes that apply) A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.					
IX. VENUE: (When completing						
encer here it the governme.	nt, its agencies or emp	outside of this District; State bloyees is a named plaintiff. It	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. f this box is checked, go to item (b).			
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Los Angeles						
The second of the government	ict; California County nt, its agencies or emp	outside of this District; State loyees is a named defendant.	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).			
County in this District:* Orange County, CA			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Orange County, CA			San Diego County, CA; Santa Clara County, CA; Virginia; Delaware,			
. vote. In fand condennatio	ct; California County n cases, use the locat	outside of this District; State i	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. ved.			
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Orange County, CA; Los Ang	eles County, CA	-				
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bern Note: In land condemnation cases	nardino, Riverside, V use the location of th	e tract of land involved	San Luis Obispo Counties			
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNE	Y (OR PRO PER):	Contam .	Date 10/22/2012			
but is used by the Clerk of the	Court for the purpose	of statistics, venue and initiat	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings e of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)			
Key to Statistical codes relating to						
Nature of Suit Cod	e Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	Cause of Action			
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))				
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)				
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.				
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42				

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

U.S.C. (g))

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Andrew Guilford and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Arthur Nakazato.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV12- 1844 AG (ANx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

G-8
2

Southern Division
411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

Eastern Division
3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134
Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.